

REMARKS

Claims 3-19, 22-24 and 26-43 are pending in the Application, of which, claims 22, 36 and 39 are independent. Claims 22, 36 and 39 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicants are amending the claims to highlight aspects that were already present in the claims and have been fully discussed in previous communications with the Patent Office. The Applicants are amending in the spirit to accommodate the Examiner and further the prosecution. Accordingly, the current amendments, that were previously present and argued to the Patent Office, do not warrant a new search.

Examiner Interview

A telephone interview was conducted on December 17, 2008, between Examiner Usmaan Saeed and F. Sirjani, as the representative of the Applicants. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to applicants during the aforesaid interview. Applicants presented their arguments regarding the patentability of claims to the Examiner and discussed the prior art in view of claim 36. The Examiner did not find the arguments persuasive. No agreement was reached.

Summary of the Arguments

Each of the independent claims of the invention are provided below. Specifically, claim 36 is discussed in greater detail because the Office action focuses on claim 36. (Office action, pp. 2-6.) A detailed discussion of each reference was provided in the previous response and is not repeated here. Applicants maintain the arguments previously presented.

Applicants submit that when all elements of each claim and their interrelationships are taken into account, each independent claim is distinguished from the combination of the cited references.

Julien is cited for the alleged teaching all elements of claim 36 except for “monitoring a current document being viewed by a user on a display” and “an information analysis device that assigns a score;” Bell is cited for the alleged teaching “monitoring a current document being viewed by a user on a display;” and Kubota is cited for the alleged teaching “an information analysis device that assigns a score” of claim 36. (Office action, p. 4 and p. 5.) According to the Office action, in addition to Julien, Kubota also allegedly teaches “an information monitoring device that monitors a user’s current document ... to identify searchable text elements within the document.” (Office action, p. 5.)

Applicants had argued that in all of the independent claims 22, 36 and 39 the elements of the claim are being performed by the machine not the user. Therefore, the proactive extracting is by the machine and not by the user.

The Office action responds that because the extraction of the information is eventually performed by the machine in Julien, then the extraction in Julien is also “proactive.” (Office action, p. 25.) The Office action reasons that the “user”, in the claims of the invention, has to open or retrieve the document that he views and therefore “user” is having an input similar to the user of Julien that is inputting the URL of the site to be searched. (Id.) The Office action further reasons that if claims taught that the document was automatically opened without user interaction, then the claim would be different from prior art. (Id.)

The above argument contained in the Office action is in conflict with several elements of the claims and, for example, it is in conflict with the fact that claim 36, before the current amendments, recited a limitation “without disrupting user’s current task on the computer and without disrupting display of said current document.” In Julien, the “user’s current task” is one and the same as the material that the user receives from the website whose URL he has punched in. The claim has two elements: “the current document” and then the “contacts” that are identified based on the information extracted from “the current document” and shown to the user “without disrupting display of said current document.”

When the user in the claimed aspects of the invention opens the document, he gets the document and he gets to view the document and additionally he gets the contact information that is found without his further interaction or input and is presented to him in addition to the document. When the user in Julien enters the URL, he gets only what the URL provides and no more; the machine is not willing to do anything more for the user of Julien. This is how the “proactive” nature of extraction in the claims is different from Julien: the machine in the invention received one input and does two tasks (show the document and show additional information) and does the second task (showing the contact information) without further user input and proactively; the machine in Julien gets one input (URL) and does one task (show the data on the website).

Rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Examiner has rejected claims 3-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 16-19, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-33, 34-37, and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Julien (U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2002/0129011) in view of Bell (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0044785) in view of Kubota (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,323).

Claims 6, 11, 12, 14 and 27 are rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Julien in view of Bell and further in view of Kubota and further in view of Lamburt (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,241).

Claim 30 is rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Julien in view of Bell, further in view of Kubota and further in view of Othmer (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064317).

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections in view of the following arguments. The claim amendments are to highlight features previously present in the claims.

Claim 22

Claim 22 recites “An information retrieval system, comprising: a database that stores contact information; an interface to a monitor displaying a document being currently viewed by a user, the user operating a task on the system; a monitoring system monitoring the document via the interface and extracting searchable text elements from the document being currently viewed; and a contact information retrieval system that retrieves contact information from the database based on the searchable text elements and that displays the retrieved contact information without disrupting the user's task on the system, wherein the document being currently viewed is a first document being retrieved by the information retrieval system responsive to a first input by the user, wherein the extracting of the searchable text elements and the displaying of the retrieved contact information to the user are performed proactively by the information retrieval system without receiving an additional input from the user, and wherein the displaying of the retrieved

contact information to the user is performed by providing a second document to the user without disrupting the display of the first document. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants respectfully submit that Julien, Kubota and Bell, taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest the limitation: “information retrieval system ... a document being currently viewed by a user, the user operating a task ... monitoring system monitoring the document ... extracting searchable text elements from the document being currently viewed ... a contact information retrieval system that retrieves contact information ... displays the retrieved contact information without disrupting the user's task on the system” of claim 22.

The current claim amendments emphasize the above-mentioned features of the invention by stating that “the document being currently viewed is a first document being retrieved by the information retrieval system responsive to a first input by the user ... the extracting ... and the displaying ... are performed proactively ... without receiving an additional input from the user, and ... the displaying of the retrieved contact information ... is performed by providing a second document to the user without disrupting the display of the first document.”

In Julien, the “user’s current task” is one and the same as the material that the user receives from the website whose URL he has punched in. The claim has two elements: “a document being currently viewed by a user” which is the same as “the first document” and then the “contacts” that are identified based on the “searchable text elements” that is information extracted from “the first document” and is shown to the user “by providing a second document to the user without disrupting the display of the first document” and without “disrupting the user's task on the system.”

Further, when the user in the claimed aspects of the invention opens the document, he gets the first document and he gets to view the first document and additionally he gets the contact information that is found without his further interaction or input and is presented to him in addition to the first document in a second document. When the user in Julien enters the URL, he gets only what the URL provides and no more; the machine is not willing to do anything more for the user of Julien. This is how the “proactive” nature of extraction in the claims is different from Julien: “the extracting of the searchable text elements and the displaying of the retrieved contact information to the user are performed proactively by the information retrieval system without receiving an additional input from the user.” (Emphasis added.) The machine in the invention receives one input and does two tasks (show the first document and show additional information in a second document) and does the second task (showing the contact information in the second document) without further user input and proactively. The machine in Julien gets one input (URL) and does one task (show the data on the website).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that, claim 22 is patentable in view of the cited references, Julien, Kubota and Bell, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 36

Claim 36 recites “An information retrieval apparatus, comprising: a database containing contact information; an information monitoring device for monitoring a current document being viewed by a user and being displayed on a computer display to identify searchable text elements within the current document; an analyzer comparing each of the searchable text elements to the contact information in the database to identify potential contact information; an information analysis device that assigns a score to the identified potential contact information; and a data

output device that notifies a user of contacts based on scores associated with the potential contact information, without disrupting user's current task on the computer, wherein the current document is a first document being retrieved by the information retrieval apparatus responsive to a first input by the user, wherein the identifying of the searchable text elements within the current document and notifying of the user of the contacts are performed proactively by the information retrieval apparatus without receiving an additional input by the user, and wherein the notifying of the user of the contacts is performed by providing a second document to the user without disrupting the display of the first document." (Emphasis added.)

For reasons presented above in the summary of arguments section and for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 22, Julien, Kubota and Bell, taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest the limitation: "information retrieval apparatus ... a current document being viewed by a user ... identify searchable text elements within the current document ... a data output device that notifies a user of contacts ... without disrupting user's current task" of claim 36.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 36 is patentable in view of the cited references whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 39

Claim 39 recites "A method for operating a computer system, a task is performed by a user on the system, the method being performed by the computer system, the method comprising: monitoring through an interface a current document displayed on a user monitor; identifying searchable portion on the current document; comparing the searchable portion with a contact information stored in a database; and, displaying the contact information on the monitor

in accordance with the comparing result without disrupting user's task on the computer, wherein the current document is a first document being retrieved by the information retrieval apparatus responsive to a first input by the user, wherein the identifying of the searchable portion on the current document and displaying the contact information on the monitor are performed proactively by the computer system without receiving an additional input from the user, and wherein the displaying of the contact information is performed by providing a second document to the user without disrupting the display of the first document." (Emphasis added.)

For reasons presented above in the summary of arguments section and for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 22, Julien, Kubota and Bell, taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest the limitation, wherein "the method being performed by the computer system ... monitoring ... a current document displayed on a user monitor; identifying searchable portion on the current document ... displaying the contact information on the monitor ... without disrupting user's task on the computer" of claim 39.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 39 is patentable in view of the cited references whether taken alone or in combination.

Dependent Claims

Lamburt is cited for the alleged teaching the "comparing the assigned scores for each match to a threshold score value" and Othmer is cited for teaching the "assigns a partial score." As such, the cited portions of these references do not appear to cure the deficiency of Julien, Kubota and Bell in teaching or suggesting all elements of the independent claims and the independent claims of this Application are believed to remain patentable over all of the cited references.

Claims 23, 24, 26-35 and 43 depend from claim 22. Claims 37, 38 and 42 depend from claim 36. Claims 3-19 and 41 depend from claim 39.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims, while continuing to traverse the Examiner's characterization of the teachings of the references used by the Examiner in rejecting these claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable by definition, by virtue of their dependence upon their respective patentable independent claims.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fariba Sirjani
Registration No. 47,947

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 29, 2009